

REMARKS

This reply is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 20, 2006, and is filed within three - (3) months following the mailing date of the Office Action. If needed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the
5 time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed. The method of payment and fees for petition fee due in connection therewith is enclosed.

Disclosure/Claims Status Summary:

10 The Examiner stated the Office Action is in response to communications filed on October 24, 2005. Claims 3-13, 17, and 19 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejection/Objection Summary:

15 In response to the communications filed on October 24, 2005, the Examiner made the following rejections and objections:

- A. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Borkowski or Jefferson;
- B. Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable
20 over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and further in view of Borkowski or Jefferson;
- C. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Eby;
- 25 D. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Williams;

- E. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Schutz;
- F. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, Borkowski or Jefferson, and Schutz as applied above, in further view of Eby;
- G. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, Borkowski or Jefferson, and Schutz as applied above, in further view of Williams;
- H. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Williams;
- I. Claims 7 and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form; and
- J. Claim 19 was allowed.

Applicant notes, with appreciation, the Examiner's notification that Claim 19 was allowed and that Claims 7 and 11 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

- A. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Borkowski or Jefferson.**

Claim 13 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

- B. Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and further in view of Borkowski or Jefferson.**

Claims 3 and 9 have been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

- 5 **C. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Eby.**

Claim 10 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

10

- D. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Williams.**

15 Claim 12 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

- 20 **E. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, and Borkowski or Jefferson as applied above, in further view of Schutz.**

Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

- 25 **F. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, Borkowski or Jefferson, and Schutz as applied above, in further view of Eby.**

Claim 6 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

5 **G. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Hallock or Bond, Borkowski or Jefferson, and Schutz as applied above, in further view of Williams.**

Claim 8 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

10

H. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meador et al. in view of Williams.

15 Claim 17 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

I. Claims 7 and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

20 Regarding Claims 7 and 11, the Examiner stated that the claims were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

25 Pursuant to the Examiner's notification of allowable claims, Claims 7 and 11 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, the Applicant believes that Claims 7 and 11 are in allowable condition and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection and provide for timely allowance of the claims.

J. Claim 19 was allowed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claim 19.

5

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the above amendment/remarks, all claims are now in allowable condition. The Applicant thus respectfully requests timely allowance of all of the pending claims.

5

Any claim amendments that are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those skilled in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. Furthermore, any new claims presented above are of course intended to avoid the prior art, but are not intended as replacements or substitutes of any cancelled claims. They are simply additional specific statements of inventive concepts described in the application as originally filed.

10
15

Further, it should be noted that amendment(s) to any claim is intended to comply with the requirements of the Office Action in order to elicit an early allowance, and is not intended to prejudice Applicant's rights or in any way to create an estoppel preventing Applicant from arguing allowability of the originally filed claim in further off-spring applications.

20

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, or believes that a conversation with either Applicant or Applicant's representative would be beneficial, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

25

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to the attached credit card form. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as

including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed. The petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 50-2738 if a credit card form has not been included with this correspondence, or if the credit card could not be charged.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcus Luis Risso

Registration No. 53,519

Tel.: (310) 589-8158